

To: Distribution  
From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia  
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on July 11, 2001. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724 (FAX) 777-3770  
Gene Dombrowski DPWT (240) 777-6086 (FAX) 777-6109  
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609 (FAX) 279-3737  
Tracey Williams WSSC (301) 206-7171 (FAX) 206-7199  
Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595 (FAX) 495-1306

STAFF

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478  
Julie Modlin CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478  
Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684 (FAX) 777-3770

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (410) 953-7440 (FAX) 953-7406  
Deane Mellander VoiceStream (240) 264-8658 (FAX) 264-8610  
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678  
M.G. Diamond Verizon Wireless (301) 951-1564  
Carolyn Mitchell Cingular Wireless  
Bruce Deppa Darnestown Assoc. (301) 963-0567  
Janet Brown Jackson, Campbell (202) 457-4263 (FAX) 457-1678  
Brian Parsons Nextel (202) 437-3665  
Maureen Smith VoiceStream  
Karl Nelson VoiceStream (410) 332-8663 (FAX) 332-8184  
Ed Donohue Cole, Raywid  
Mike Budde Sprint PCS (443) 255-0319 (FAX) 636-5287  
Robin Bryan Darnestown Assoc. (301) 330-1287  
Tim Boyce Sprint PCS (201) 684-4135  
Kurt Bitting Sprint PCS (201) 684-4450  
Valerie Grigg Devis WFI for Verizon (410) 309-0569 (410) 309-0573

Action Item: Approval of June 5, 2001 Minutes: Pat Hanehan moved the minutes be approved as written. Michael Ma seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda Item: Jane Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator for an explanation of the criteria used in selecting items for the consent agenda for today's meeting. Bob Hunnicutt explained that when the group recently began using a consent agenda, the Tower Coordinator was asked to only include applications where the carrier was simply changing out existing antennas for new antennas and there were no other issues involved. At the last meeting, Ms. Lawton asked that other by-right applications could be included as consent agenda items if there were no structural or ground use issues and the attachment was fairly straightforward. Accordingly, the applications on today's consent agenda included those kinds of applications to be reviewed this month. Mr.

Hunnicuttt stated that the consent agenda included applications for replacement antennas, attachments to existing monopoles and towers with no conditions on the recommendation, and simple, straightforward attachments to existing buildings. Jane Lawton stated that she was concerned because it appeared that some of the antennas were much higher than the building height and she would like to pull items #1, 4, 9, and 10 for that reason. Tracey Williams agreed with Ms. Lawton, and stated she was also concerned about the antenna height above the roof. Ms. Lawton added that she would also like to pull item #3 because of interest expressed to her by neighboring residents. Michael Ma asked to pull item #8 also.

#### Remaining Consent Agenda Items:

Action Item: Cingular Wireless application to mount antennas on the penthouse at the 60' level on an existing 3 story building located at 12125 Veirs Mill Road in Silver Spring (Application #200106-03).

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 3) 66" antennas with 3) 72" antennas, and add 3 additional antennas on the roof at the 224' level of the 212' Clark building located at 7500 Old Georgetown Road in Bethesda (Application #200106-08).

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6) 54" antennas with 6) 72" antennas on the roof at the 117' level of the 90' Equitable Bank building located at 11501 Georgia Avenue in Wheaton (Application #200106-09).

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 170' level on a 190' tree monopole to be constructed on the Clement property located at 25217 Peach Tree Road in Clarksburg (Application #200106-10).

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas at the 200' level of the 226' Hights Branch tower located at 6300 Damascus Road in Laytonsville (Application #200106-16).

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the remaining items on the consent agenda listed above be recommended. Michael Ma seconded the motion and they were unanimously approved with no discussion.

#### Regular Agenda Items:

Action Item: Cingular Wireless application to mount antennas on the roof at the 68' level on the existing 58' Schlesinger building located at 3720 Farragut Avenue in Kensington (Application #200106-02).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and stated that these were sled-mounted antennas. Jane Lawton asked why there was a need for the sled which raised the antennas above the roof line. Jim Michal replied that it was often an issue with the landlord because they may not want the roof penetrated with mounting poles to support the antennas. He added that in some other cases, the antennas may be sled-mounted in order to get them near the edge of the roof for increased transmission capabilities.

Carolyn Mitchell added that for this application, Cingular also needed additional height to meet coverage requirements for the antennas at this location. In response to questions, Julie Modlin added that another reason for sled mounting would be to properly align an array of antennas for each sector; otherwise the transmission characteristics would not provide the desired coverage.

Michael Ma asked why there was a need to have the antennas at the edge of the building as opposed to the center of the building where they would not be so obvious. Jim Michal explained that if the antennas were in the center of the building, the building might shield the signal transmission. Bob Hunnicutt used the white board to illustrate that if the antennas were in the center of the building, the signals to and from areas in close proximity to the building may be blocked or "shadowed" by the rooftop. By placing the antennas at the edge of the building the full transmission capabilities of the antennas could be achieved.

Motion: Gene Dombrowski moved the application be recommended. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to mount antennas on the bell tower at the 58' level of Our Lady of Visitation Church located at 14139 Seneca Road in Darnestown (Application #200106-04).

Jane Lawton stated she wanted to discuss this application because some citizens had concerns regarding the siting, and asked for a presentation of this siting by the carrier.

Lee Jarmon summarized the application and noted that the antennas would be attached to the exterior surface of the support columns for the bell tower and that the antennas would be painted a color to blend in with the bricks.

Jane Lawton asked Bruce Deppa to explain the citizens' concerns regarding this attachment. Mr. Deppa stated that the Association did not object to Nextel's attachment to the church, but they were concerned about accommodating additional antennas which other carriers may wish to attach to this structure in the future. He added that the Association had contacted the church about providing additional co-location opportunities, but the church had expressed concern about additional equipment shelters around the property. Mr. Deppa stated that with the recent revision to the zoning ordinance to permit larger shelters, it may be possible that a larger equipment shelter could be constructed by Nextel to accommodate future carriers, eliminating the need for further construction and multiple buildings on the church property. He stated that since the citizens had not reviewed the design plans for this attachment until today, they wished to have more time to look at the plans and talk to the church to see if accommodations could be made to permit additional future attachments without the need to erect a monopole in the Darnestown area.

Ms. Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to address the question of attachment of additional antennas to the bell tower and if there

were other carriers that were seeking to place antennas in this vicinity.

Mr. Hunnicutt distributed photographs of the church for the group to review and described the bell tower. He stated that in reviewing the photographs and the antenna design, one could see there is not much space on the support columns for additional antennas to be attached. He added that in other cases where antennas had been sited in steeples or bell towers, RF friendly material had replaced existing materials to permit the radio frequencies to penetrate the exterior covering concealing the antenna within. In this case, the inside of the structure is completely open for the bells and the roof is slanted, making it an unlikely structure for a similar concealed design.

Robin Bryan asked if additional antennas could be placed on the roof itself. Julie Modlin replied that since the antennas needed to be vertical and since this roofline is sloped, antennas placed on the roof would be quite noticeable.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the Nextel equipment shelter was to be located behind the building and was Nextel's typical 12' x 20' shelter. He added that the only other carrier he could think of who wanted to locate in that vicinity was Verizon, but given the RF propagation maps submitted by Verizon and the height of the bell tower, it would need to be perhaps 100' taller than the existing bell tower. He added that for any other antennas, the elevation would be based on the physical characteristics and the RF requirements for the other carrier when they did their design analysis.

Mr. Deppa replied that the Association's RF engineers had advised them that the vertical separation of antennas was no longer a factor in antenna siting as evidenced by the proliferation of antennas on water tanks and building rooftops where there is very limited or no vertical separation. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that the square footage surface area of rooftops and water tanks was considerably larger than the small square footage area of this bell tower, so vertical separation and other physical issues may be a problem on this small bell tower.

Jane Lawton asked if Verizon had considered this property for its antennas. M.G. Diamond stated that if this was the property of the Archdiocese, there was a previous application to erect a 180' monopole on this property but it was not pursued because of citizen objections. Mr. Hunnicutt reminded the group that Verizon had submitted 3 applications in the Darnestown area: the first was at a landscaping company on Route 28; the second on the Archdiocese property near where this bell tower is located, neither of which were pursued due to citizen objections; and the third was for a new 180' monopole at the Butler School property farther north on Germantown Road.

Mr. Deppa noted that Crown, the applicant for the Butler School monopole, was a tower management company whose interests were to erect as big a tower as possible and that is why they want a monopole 180' tall. Mr. Diamond replied that Verizon's first application for that height was prior to Crown's involvement and

was based on coverage requirements.

Jane Lawton asked if approving this application would preclude another carrier from attaching to either the bell tower or elsewhere on the property. Mr. Hunnicutt replied he could think of nothing that would preclude other carriers from submitting applications for this site.

Mr. Deppa again stated that the Association was in favor of Nextel's application but asked that this item be deferred until they had a chance to review the plans for this siting. He added that the Association was led to believe that these antennas would be inside the bell tower and not on the exterior wall where they would be more visible.

Jane Lawton asked Nextel if it would consider tabling this application until next month. Lee Jarmon stated that Nextel would like the TTFCG to act on this application today. He stated that Nextel had done all that it could to address the usual concerns expressed by the TTFCG and those of the church in negotiating this lease.

Jane Lawton agreed that it appeared to be a good siting and that by painting the antennas to match the brick, Nextel minimized the appearance of the antennas. She stated that the problem for the TTFCG was how could it delay a by-right application in consideration of the impact of future sitings at this location when they had no knowledge of any other carriers seeking attachment at this site. Bruce Deppa stated he knew that Sprint and Verizon were interested in siting antennas in Darnestown. The Sprint representative, Mike Budde, stated he did not know if that was an area targeted by Sprint or not. Ms. Lawton stated she believed additional carriers could still submit requests to build another tower on the property or attach other antennas as they deemed it necessary and viable, and that acting on this application today would not have a negative impact on future attachments.

Pat Hanehan cited the photographs and the illustrations in the application attachments and noted that he thought Nextel had done an excellent job in siting these antennas and saw no basis for a deferral to next month. He added that to defer action on this item would send a bad message to the carriers, especially in this case where Nextel had done such an admirable job in the design. He added that even if the group recommended this application today the citizens could still continue discussing their plans with the church over the coming weeks.

Tracey Williams stated that if the church was concerned with additional shelters being scattered about the property, future carriers could about their shelters alongside Nextel's shelter, therefore keeping the shelters in the same vicinity on the property. She stated that in the past, WSSC had carriers cluster equipment shelters in the same area and suggested that two storage shelters could accomplish the same purpose. She stated she would also prefer to act on this application today, and she commended Nextel on doing an excellent job on siting at this location.

Jane Lawton stated she appreciated the citizen interest in this application and encouraged them to continue to work with the church to provide a means to provide for additional carriers. Bruce Deppa stated that the Association was simply trying to find alternatives to construction of a monopole or tall tower in the Darnestown area.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Tracey Williams seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas to the penthouse walls at the 122' level of a 108' building located at 6110 Executive Boulevard in Rockville (Application #200106-07).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that these were flush mounted antennas on the penthouse wall.

Motion: Gene Dombrowski moved the application be recommended. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 157' level of a 180' monopole at the Wheaton Regional Park Maintenance Facility located at 12101 Alpert Lane in Wheaton (Application #200106-11).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Michael Ma asked if Sprint had discussed this attachment with the M-NCPPC. Mike Budde stated Sprint had spoken with Terry Brooks who stated he would not negotiate further until the TTFCG had reviewed and recommended the application.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Gene Dombrowski seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas on the penthouse roof at the 131' level on the 116' Takoma Business Center building located at 6930 Carroll Avenue in Takoma Park (Application #200106-13).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted these antennas were attached to the penthouse walls.

Motion: Michael Ma moved the application be recommended. Gene Dombrowski seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas on the roof and penthouse walls at the 173' level on the 162' Parkside Plaza building located at 9030 Sligo Creek Parkway in Silver Spring (Application #200106-14).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted these were sled-mounted antennas. Ms. Modlin asked for direction on how the Tower Coordinator should handle these kinds of attachments for the next agenda, and asked if they should be on the consent

agenda or not. Jane Lawton stated it was fine for them to be on the consent agenda as long as the Tower Coordinator had reviewed them and was satisfied that there were no unusual circumstances that should be brought to the group's attention.

Motion: Michael Ma moved the application be recommended. Tracey Williams seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream Wireless application to attach antennas on a proposed 17' extension platform on 153' Quailhill monopole located at 301 Quailhill Lane (a.k.a. 18743 New Hampshire Avenue) in Brookeville (Application #200106-05).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that although the Special Exception authorized this monopole to be 170' tall it was only constructed at 153'. VoiceStream intended to extend the monopole to the full height approved.

Bob Hunnicutt explained that he had asked Jim Michal for an explanation as to why the monopole was only built to 153'. Mr. Hunnicutt noted that in the Special Exception, Cellular One, the monopole owner, argued that it needed 170' to attain the RF coverage needed. Mr. Michal stated that a likely explanation might be that at the time the monopole was erected, Cellular One only had a 153' monopole in inventory and was perhaps in a rush to get the site online, so they installed what was on hand.

Jane Lawton asked if VoiceStream could use the nearby transmission line towers instead of extending this monopole. Bob Hunnicutt explained that the transmission line towers were farther to the north, and based upon the review of the RF analysis submitted by VoiceStream, use of the PEPCO towers would most likely not meet VoiceStream's coverage requirements. Deane Mellander agreed that was the case.

Mr. Hunnicutt noted that the existing monopole had a flange at the top for attaching an extension. Julie Modlin noted that the Tower Coordinator recommended this application conditioned on submission of structural analysis to the Department of Permitting Services with a copy to the TTFCG verifying that the monopole can safely accommodate the additional antennas.

Motion: Tracey Williams moved the application be recommended. Gene Dombrowski seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Verizon Wireless application to attach antennas at the 270' level on the 480' Shumaker guyed lattice tower located at 16700 Barnesville Road in Barnesville (Application #200106-06).

Julie Modlin summarized the extensive comments regarding this site. Ms. Modlin noted that this recommendation was conditioned on 1) a clear statement that this tower is stronger than the previous tower erected at this site; 2) an explanation as to the cause and resulting effect leading to the collapse of the initial tower; and 3) a list of precautions being taken to preclude a recurrence of such a failure. It was also conditioned on any modifications necessary to the Special Exception to permit the

expanded ground space to accommodate the additional equipment for new carriers. She added that yesterday afternoon Verizon submitted a letter from Pinnacle Towers explaining why the tower collapsed. Pinnacle's letter explained that a raised dump truck caught one of the guy wires and pulled the tower down. In response to further questions, Mr. Hunnicutt explained that it appears from the letter that the guy wire was not broken by the truck, but the truck actually snagged the guy wire and as the truck moved forward, it pulled on the guy wire which caused the tower to collapse despite the other guy wires supporting the tower.

Jane Lawton asked if this tower had to go through Special Exception review again. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that as he understood it, since a Special Exception for this tower had been granted and Pinnacle was simply replacing the original tower that was authorized by the Special Exception, there is no need for further review of the tower itself by the Board of Appeals. He added, however, that because there is additional equipment shelter space needed beyond what was originally approved, there may be a need to modify the Special Exception to approve the additional use of the land. He explained that the structural analysis conditions are recommended because the Tower Coordinator has two previous structural reports that stated the original tower was at maximum capacity and could not accommodate additional antennas. He noted that even though Verizon had submitted yet a third structural analysis, the wording in that report said that the analysis was conducted based on the original design using the original members. Consequently, he did not understand how the new tower could be reconstructed using the specifications of the original tower, yet even more weight and equipment could be added to this facility. He stated he had requested an explanation from Verizon but had not been provided with one. He noted that he had been verbally informed that the new tower was stronger and had asked for written documentation of this but nothing had been submitted.

M.G. Diamond stated that if it had not been for this additional attachment, nothing would have to go through the TTFCG review or review by the Board of Appeals. Pat Hanehan noted that since there is another set of antennas being added, it is appropriate to ask for this additional information now. Jane Lawton added that since this structure failed once and it appeared as though the same structure was being re-constructed it was important for the TTFCG to understand how it would not fail again.

Motion: Michael Ma moved the application be tabled until all answers to the Tower Coordinator's questions had been provided. Tracey Williams seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to replace an existing 80' WSSC communications pole with a 105' pole and attach antennas at the 100' level of the pole located at Dewey Road and Fernhill Road in Garrett Park (Application #200106-12).

Julie Modlin summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked who owns the pole. Tracey Williams stated the pole is owned by WSSC



and used for their own communications and that they would relocate their antennas to the new pole, which is located on M-NCPPC property. Michal Ma asked if Sprint had negotiated a lease agreement with the M-NCPPC. Mike Budde stated he had started negotiations but the M-NCPPC would not negotiate further without review and recommendation by the TTFCG.

Michal Ma asked if this would go through the Mandatory Referral process, and wondered where one draws the line on determining when a replacement such as this needs to go through Mandatory Referral.

Pat Hanehan stated this was like some of the applications reviewed by the TTFCG for the MCPS sites such as Sherwood High School, where light poles had been replaced with new structures that could accommodate telecommunications facilities. Tracey Williams added that WSSC had no objection to this application going through Mandatory Referral. Bob Hunnicutt commented that this siting was somewhat different from the Sherwood High School site because in that case, the light pole was replaced with a considerably taller monopole which could accommodate multiple cellular carriers. In this application, he noted that there was only about 30' being added to the height to accommodate the attachment of antennas.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Gene Dombrowski seconded the motion and it was approved with Tracey Williams abstaining.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas at the 220' level of the 226' Hights Branch tower located at 6300 Damascus Road in Laytonsville (Application #200106-15).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and noted that VoiceStream was also on the agenda today to attach to this facility. She stated that the difference between the two sitings was that VoiceStream was locating within the approved existing equipment compound but it appeared that Sprint was going to be expanding the area beyond what was approved in the Special Exception. Janet Brown stated that Sprint was not expanding the compound size but was locating within the originally approved 50' x 50' equipment space. Upon review of the site plan and the original Special Exception documents which Sprint provided at the meeting, the Tower Coordinator agreed that Sprint was going within the existing equipment compound.

Motion: Gene Dombrowski moved the application be recommended. Tracey Williams seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to place antennas in the steeple at the 90' level of the Mill Creek Methodist Church located at 7101 Horizon Terrace in Rockville (Application #200106-17).

Julie Modlin summarized the application and asked Nextel to explain the "garden" antennas it proposed to attach to the steeple.

Lee Jarmon explained that garden antennas were cylinders

somewhat larger than the regular antennas which enabled a single set of antennas within the cylinder to serve all three sectors, and that this antenna would be mounted inside the steeple and concealed by RF friendly material so no one would be able to see it. The group commended Nextel on this siting.

Motion: Michael Ma moved the application be recommended. Tracey Williams seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Carrier Meeting: Bob Hunnicutt reminded the group that at the last meeting they had received a letter from the carriers requesting a special TTFCG meeting to discuss issues related to the Bill Hussmann letter of May 22, 2001 sent to the TTFCG.

Jane Lawton asked what the urgency was regarding this meeting. Ed Donohue explained that they had one application that had been through the M-NCPPC review and three more pending that would undoubtedly go through the same review and the same questions would be raised. Consequently, AT&T needed to know as soon as possible how the TTFCG intended to respond to the M-NCPPC's request.

Jane Lawton stated that she understood the one application that had gone through the M-NCPPC review was now scheduled to go to the Board of Appeals and did not understand how responding to Mr. Hussmann's letter would impact the action on that particular application. Mr. Donohue stated it was true the first application would go before the Board in October but that one and the other three applications would most likely be subject to the same questions in the review by the Board of Appeals and M-NCPPC.

Jim Michal added that the carriers' concern was that the M-NCPPC is asking the TTFCG to become involved in making recommendations on the carriers' system design which exceeded the TTFCG's authority. Mr. Ma added that he believed that the concerns expressed in Mr. Hussmann's letter were still valid issues for the M-NCPPC even though Mr. Hussmann has retired and there is a new Chair of the Board. He stated that the M-NCPPC wanted to be sure it would have all the information it needed to base its decision on these kinds of applications.

Jane Lawton stated she did not believe that the TTFCG could state there are absolutely no alternatives in these cases, as Mr. Hussmann requests. She thought the role of the TTFCG is different in its creation by the County Council than what the M-NCPPC believed it to be. Michael Ma stated he could bring other M-NCPPC members to the meeting with the carriers to participate in the discussion.

Pat Hanehan asked if there would be a draft reply to Mr. Hussmann for the meeting with the carriers. Jane Lawton asked if the Tower Coordinator could draft a reply for that meeting. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he thought it would be better if they first had the meeting, heard the information presented by the carriers, and then prepared a draft reply for the TTFCG to review and approve. Ms. Lawton and Mr. Hanehan stated it would be helpful to have

something in writing as a talking point to guide the meeting discussion. Ms. Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to draft a letter for discussion at the meeting with the carriers.

The meeting was scheduled for July 25, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he would reserve a meeting room and notify all interested parties of the meeting date, time, and place.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, August 15, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.